

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Vigunia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10:075,764	02/15:2002	Takayuki Yamada	1509.1016	9489
21171	7590 09:03-2003			
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			EXAMINER	
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PRASAD, CHANDRIKA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>	<del>,</del>	,, <del>,,,</del>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/075,764	YAMADA, TAKAYUKI			
,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Chandrika Prasad	2839			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 10 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to aviginal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	•				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);			
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);				
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.			
NOTE:					
$3. \boxtimes$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	proved by the Examiner.			
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)				
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		41			
		i.nl			
		Chandrika Prasad Examiner Art Unit: 2839			

Continuation of 10. Other: The arguments are not persuasive. Barabi (6,208,155 Figures 3a, 3B clearly shows the tubular member 51 having its ends engaging the first and second plungers 63, 65. The arguments related to claim 8 are not supported by claim language. Regarding claim 15, it is inherent that the platform 25 can be replaced by another because it is separate from the other elements. Furthermore Claim 3 is improper because it does not further limit claim 1 upon which it depends on.